THE

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA

OR THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

A monthly Journal devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.

COMMENCED ON THE QUEEN'S COMMEMORATION DAY, 1897.

Vol. IX.] NOVEMBER & DECEMBER, 1908. No. 5 & 6

THE MISCARRIAGE OF LIFE IN THE WEST.

by

P. RAMANATHAN, C.M.G., K.C.,

H. M. Solicitor-General, Ceylon.

How interesting to every thoughtful person is the problem whether his life is carrying him to the proper goal or not! The mind that runs indiscreetly with the senses, as they go a-hunting for sights, sound, smells, touches and tastes, is much too occupied with external things to grasp the importance of this issue. When the senses get wearied of their respective works, they fall asleep and rise freshened for the hunt again. At a later stage of existence, when the evils of self-indulgence have been repeatedly felt and much pain caused thereby to the mind, it refuses to run promiscuously with the senses, and the senses, deprived of the willing support of the mind, remain proportionately undrawn by sense-objects. It is at this period of comparative peace that the mind comes to know its separateness from the senses and its capacity

for righteous work by control of the senses. formation of sound thoughts, and correlation of them in the way that leads to the discovery of what lies under the surface of things. What is the first deep truth learnt in this manner, as the result or fruit of worldly experience, by the analytic mind which refuses to be in bondage to the senses? It is this—the beauty of things perceived by the senses turns into ugliness, and the joys arising from them change into sorrows. The more clearly one sees that the attractions of nature, including the human body, and the pleasures which spring from a contemplation of them, are as perishable as quicksand heaps in a flowing river, the more urgent to him becomes the solution of the problem whether his life is carrying him to the proper destination or not. For if the mind is convinced that it is folly to be wedded too deeply to things perceivable by the senses, owing to the certainty of their decay and disappearance, it will assuredly turn from such passing shows and look eagerly for something more real in the world to occupy itself with, and delight in, without the interruptions of sorrow, anger and hate. Such is the experience of men and women on whom the truth has dawned that beautiful forms and sensuous pleasures wither like the grass of the field. It is to this class of persons that the question of the miscarriage of life will be of interest.

We have next to consider what life means in such expressions as "the miscarriage of life," "the right use of life," and "is life worth caring for?" In regard to these phrases, which, be it noted, rise instinctively to the lips of those who are not too fond of sensuous enjoyments, it will not do to think of life as a round of pleasures, or as joys mixed with sorrows, or as animate existence with its phases of growth and decay. None of these meanings will help us to answer rightly the question raised, for in it is involved the profound truth, little known to the sensuous-minded, but universally attested by sanctified sages as an incontrovertible fact, that souls have been endowed with instruments of breath, knowledge, and action, as well as different spheres of training (such as

home, school and profession, married life and society, Government and politics, industry and amusement,) for the beneficent purpose of emancipating themselves from corruption ; and therefore, unless "life" is taken to mean the aggregate of those ministers of the soul who labour for it, the question whether one's "life" is "carrying' one to his destination or not, cannot be answered properly.

The truth that "life," in one of its deeper senses, means the ministers of the soul, has been recognised by thoughtful men in the West. About thirty years ago, when the views of Schopenhauer and Hartmann began to prevail and the question "Is life worth living ?" became the topic of the day, it was conceded that "life" was a mystery in all its forms, vegetable, animal and human and various were the solutions offered in the monthly magazines of the period. Speaking of human life, St. George Mivart said : "'An inevitable instinct impels us all to seek our own happiness and to gratify our passions and desires, though we are by no means compelled always in all cases to choose whatever we most like. Yet, however we may suffer ourselves to be borne passively along the pleasure seeking current, our reason can, even while we are so borne along, ask the question : Are we rational if we acquiesce in happiness as the supreme and deliberate aim of our life ? The answer of reason to itself must surely be that the rational end of life is that which *should* be its end, *i.e.*, which ought to be its end ; and 'ought' is meaningless without the conception of 'duty.'" He came to the conclusion that "life" meant fulfilment of duty ; for such fulfilment the will should be exercised in accordance with reason and apart from the pleasures of the moment ; and that the exercise of the will in this manner was the highest act of which we are capable, and that to which all our lower passions and faculties minister (art. on "The Meaning of Life," in the *Nineteenth Century*, March, 1879).

Reason and will are, indeed, most important parts of life. But life is more than reason and will, for the "life" of a man is

said to be extinct when his "breath" ceases to function in the body. What is this "breath"? It is not a passing breeze chased away by another which follows it. The breath of life, that is, the "breath" *called* "life" (as in the expression "the continent of Europe," which means the continent *called* Europe) is not a passing gust, but an aerially-constituted power which expires and inspires in a settled rhythmic manner, while located in the body, and which in the act of inspiring draws the atmospheric air into the channels of the body, and in the act of expiring expels it in regular succession, and which further makes many other delicate adjustments conducive to the safety and proper working of the mind and body. It is called *prana* in Sanskrit, or life, or the principle of breath, or the breather, because, say the sages, it is not only powerful but also intelligent in its own way, and accommodates itself to every conceivable position, and keeps order among other aerially-constituted powers within us, when disarrangement takes place. Sages skilled in *pranayama yoga*, or the art of breath-control, and their apt pupils, are equally certain that the *prana* (or the breath named life) in the body permeates every other instrument of the soul, and imparts to them both initiatory movement and endurance in their respective works. Hence the word *prana*, or life, is often used to include all its colleagues.

The greatest of these colleagues is the mind (*manas*), the thinker, or the intelligent and powerful entity which makes thought out of sense-percepts, and correlates them in the most wonderful manner. In the *Bhagavad Gita* is declared the truth that the mind is the instrument by which the resurrection of the soul or spirit is effected. "The uplifting of the soul (*atma uddharanam*) from corruption has to be done by the mind. Since mind only is the ally of the soul, and mind only the enemy of the soul, the mind should not be made impure by letting it run on sensuous things" (vi. 5). A mind that capers about indiscreetly with the senses becomes quite useless for the edification of the soul. It cannot build it up in love and light. If the ministers of the soul do not

assiduously keep themselves clear of the pollutions of worldliness, which is another name for that element of corruption in man which implies him to be selfish and to indulge freely in the grosser forms of sensuous enjoyment, they will not be able to guide or carry the soul to its proper haven of Light and Love. Overcome by the wild fancies of ignorance and haste, they will drift further and further away from that glorious port with their precious charge. This drifting away of the mind into sensuous planes, and its inability to serve the spirit as it should, is the meaning of "life miscarrying." It must be carefully remembered that we are now concerned with inner, not outward things; that the Light and Love to be reached, as well as the soul and its guides or carriers, are housed in the body; that the journey of life does not mean the movement of the body from one place to another in the objective world, but the turning of the mind from things worldly to things godly, and the awakening of the soul to a knowledge of God, and that unless the mind and the other ministers of the soul are cultured and strengthened, under the direction of apt teachers, for lawful and loveful works, they cannot quicken the soul, *i.e.*, make the soul to recognise its fallen condition and rise to its own spiritual state, so as to know (as only it can know) and be and one with God, the Eternal Being, who is in all, through all, and above all, who is imperceptible to the senses and unthinkable by the mind, but who is knowable by the purified soul. It is positively true that the awakening of the soul to God does not take place till the interest of its ministers turns from the things of the spirit (soul). The moment the mind's attention or gaze is fixed steadily inwards, the soul awakens, like the lotus-bud in the morning sun, and gives all its energy to the study of itself and its relationship with God and the subjective and objective worlds.

The solution of the problem of the miscarriage of life thus necessitates a careful examination and ascertainment of

(1) The being and properties of the soul;

(2) The nature of the corrupt power which holds the soul in bondage ;

(3) The being and ways of God, who mercifully emancipates the soul and takes it back, when purified, to be in constant fellowship with Him ;

(4) The nature and functions of the different instruments with which the soul is endowed for the attainment of spiritual freedom ;

(5) The spheres of training ordained for the culture and purification of the instruments of the soul ; and

(6) The special methods by which the soul may be sanctified, that is, isolated from all the entanglements of corruption.

This is a severe course of study and training which will tax one's powers to the utmost, but it is fully worth the trouble, because it is the very kind of education which, when combined with exercises in godliness, leads to actual knowledge of God, and to a complete emancipation from sorrow, anger, fear and hate.

Supposing we have students qualified in mind and body to hear and understand the truths relating to spiritual life, our first duty to them is to free them from the vain convictions to which they have been bred from their infancy—to disentangle them from the bonds of common mistake as well as of learned ignorance. Every land and age has its own obstructions to the comprehension and practice of the principles of true life. The difficulties which beset the seeker in India at the present day, for instance, are different from those of the seeker in Europe. A consideration of the main causes of the miscarriage of life in India—such as, firstly, the corporeal caste system which has all but strangled the intellectual caste system taught by sages under the name of *Varnasrama*

Dharma, for the practical advancement of all who would be spiritual in every part of the globe ; and, secondly, the utter forgetfulness of the truth that the works section of the Vedas and Agamas was designed only for awakening the spirit to a knowledge of itself and of God --is not called for in this paper. For the present we must concern ourselves with the obstacles in Christendom to spiritual progress.

In Western lands there is little effort made to distinguish between the kernel and the shell—the essence and the excrescences—of religion. Notwithstanding the assurance of Christ Jesus that His doctrines existed from the foundation of the world, those who call themselves Christians attach the greatest importance to the history of verbal controversies in the different centuries following His era. More than thirty years ago, Mr. Gladstone bewailed " the singularly multiform and confused aspect of religious thought in Cristendom," and said : "At every point there start into action multitudes of aimless or erratic forces, crossing and jostling one another, and refusing not only to be governed, but even to be classified. Any attempt to group them, however slightly and however roughly, if not hopeless, is daring" (art. on " The Courses of Religious Thought," in the *Contemp. Rev.*, June, 1876). The numerous controversies which have arisen in and out of Christian councils are due to the literary ability as well as the spiritnal ignorance of those learned in the words of the Bible. Not being delivered from " the oldness of the letter," as observed by St. Paul, which corresponds to the *purva paksham* of Indian epistemology, they have been too prone to differentiate and too contentious, and this attitude of the mind is fatal to the religious life itself. Such persons know not what religion truly is, and are therefore addicted to the habit of attaching needless importance to unessential growths in Christian belief. Narrow in mind, they seek to monopolise God, though He is everywhere, and has manifested Himself from the remotest times, æons before Jesus was sanctified and sent into Judæa, up to the present day, to everyone who has renounced at heart the deceptive attractions of the world

and longed for grace. How few in Christendom know that religion does not consist in words, professions, and ceremonies, but in heartfelt longing for the Imperishable Substrate of all things! The names and forms, ideals and practices of every creed, are intended only to create a love for God, a bond of union between God and man. Religion, from *religare*, to bind, is the love-bond which unites man to God. This love of God is the essence of religion. When it has arisen in the heart, it is destined to grow fuller and fuller by association with godly men and by frequent meditation on things spiritual, and to enter into union with Love Infinite, even as a river fed by perennial streams is bound to join the ocean, howsoever distant. Articles of faith and dogmatic teachings, being only methods for causing the love of God to spring in the heart, are not religion in the highest sense of the term, for the religious man is he who lives for god through love of God. He is not controversial, defiant, or monopolising. He is not jealous that God has manifested Himself beyond the bounds of his own sect. He welcomes with joy the tidings of divine grace wheresoever shown, for he knows that his God lives and reigns far beyond his own little neighbourhood.

Another grand difficulty in the West is the triumvirate of theology, philosophy, and science, which have made sceptics and agnostics of seekers by thousands. For fifteen centuries after the days of Jesus, the people implicitly believed the bishops and clergy of the Church. But when the fierce controversies of the Reformations arose, and the current of thought initiated by Bacon, Descartes, Locke and others began to flow steadily, widened by the discoveries of physical science and astronomy, the intelligent among the faithful were dismayed to find that the authorities of the Church were not, in the words of St. Paul, "apt to teach or convince the gainsayers." Their faith was shaken when the increasing sense of law produced by the study of physical sciences forced them "more and more to attribute all the phenomena that meet them in actual life or history to normal, rather than to abnormal, agencies" (Lecky's *History of Rationalism in Europe*

ch. iii.). They could not believe in abnormal revelations and miracles, nor accept the usual interpretations of the hard sayings of the Bible. The ancient claim of theology to speak with authority on all subjects of inquiry was rejected, and indeed relinquished: "It restricts itself to the region of faith, and leaves to philosophy and science the region of inquiry" (*History of Philosophy*, Prolog. 1). In this field of free investigation, science deals with demonstrable or verifiable facts only, and philosophy consists of the interpretations of such facts and their possible causes, as also of purely speculative thought respecting things that transcend the senses. The West is ruled by this strange coalition. But there is no cohesion or consistency in it. The standpoints of view of the theologian, the philosopher, and the scientist are different from each other. The theologian proclaims God as the goal of life, believing the testimony of the Biblical sages The philosopher and the scientist have no such belief or goal, being prepared to go wherever the imaginative or hypothetical reasoning of the one, or the matter-of-fact experiment (on bodies perceivable by the senses) of the other, takes them. "We have scanned the heavens and the earth, but we have no evidence of God's existence; we do not know Him," say they. It is thus not difficult to see that the so-called triumvirate is a house divided against itself. The three powers confound and unsettle each other, and everyone else, by their discordant notes. Hence, it is usual in the West to say: "Science declares so and so, philosophy so and so, and theology so and so; and now what do *you* say?" And the reply is: "I don't *know*, I am sure, but I *think* it is so and so." What progress is possible in this unsettled state of knowledge, in this reign of controversy?

Nevertheless, the West is firmly persuaded that it is progressing satisfactorily. It is proud of its "success" in industry, science, and politics, and claims to have created, and to live in, an age of progress. "Fifty years of ever-broadening commerce, fifty years

of ever-brightening science, and fifty years of ever-widening empire," represent the cry of those who are satisfied with material prosperity, even though its silver lines are set on a background of squalid poverty and lawless schemes of revolution. Are we really living in an age of progress, or is it only a flattering fancy which obstructs a true perspective of life and lulls people to slumber in error, in imminent peril of losing a life's opportunity? The subject is worthy of careful analysis.

What is the true position of Western nations in regard to what is called industrial progress?

Industry is the diligent employment of the mind, hand, and eye (or any other sense) on the production of somethtng that is useful or ornamental; and industrial progress is the constant exercise of the creative talent upon the production of things for sensuous enjoyment. To the producer his occupation brings some money by the sale of his work, so that he is able to supply himself and those whom he loves with the needs and comforts of the body. A more enduring return to the steadfast worker is the improvement of his mind. When it is set upon industrial work regularly, it becomes steady, sharp, and discriminating, and therefore thinks straight and sees clear, especially if it is literate and law-abiding. It then becomes reflective. During this stage of introspection it discovers signs of the spirit within, and its interest in matters concerning the spirit grows to be keen. Even as in days gone by the mind stood united to the things of the flesh, it now prefers union with the spirit. Once carnally-minded and therefore disturbed easily, given to hate, wanting in restfulness and crass in understanding, it is now spiritually-minded, and therefore forgiving, charitable, peaceful, and enlightened. This is the history of the mind set on industrial work. That work, done ably and with a law-abiding heart, is indeed the way to the goal called spiritual-mindedness, or that state of the mind wherein it does not

allow itself to be drawn this way or that way by the likes and dislikes of the body, but remains true to the spirit, which is love and light

Two classes of benefits flow from industrial work, one external and the other internal. The external benefits are the supplying of increased comforts and conveniences to the body and the embellishing of houses and cities. But these are all perishable. Taught to make bubbles out of soap and water, a boy gave his mind to that work, blew the bubbles through his tube, and contemplated them as they floated gaily in the air. The hand that worked to produce the glittering effect rested, as the mind and eye watched the vainglorious thing fading in the distance. The boy felt happy, but that happiness was as fleeting as the bubble itself. In a similar way did Alexander the Great and Napoleon tho First project empires, which rose and burst even as they were looking on. The external benefits of work, industrial or political, are comparatively of little value to the worker himself. To him, far more important is the internal benefit accruing to the mind which has done its work ably and justly. Such a mind, being cleansed and strengthened, becomes qualified for the higher work of calm reflection and meditation, by which alone the spirit within may be found. If men, individually or collectively, rest content with the external benefits of industrial work, without striving hard for the internal benefits also, the chief end of industrial work will be missed.

The expansion of the industrial arts at home and the attainment of commercial supremacy abroad are not commendable if they stand divorced from spirituality. The spread of perishable wares for the convenience and adornment of perishable bodies is vain if the producers and carriers of them do not know how to save their souls from wreck and ruin in the wide seas of sensuousness and mean competition, and if the consumers of the goods d

not take care to buy only what they really need and so prevent the pampering of the senses, which promotes the growth of emotion, irreverence, and frivolity. The industry and commerce of England, which are said to be the " foundations of her pride," are, in the absence of love for the welfare of the spirit, like fuel to the fire of sensuousness, which, alas ! has been burning in the people for some centuries, and slowly withering what is holy and beautiful in them. If the artisans and traders of the country live for the spirit, while working hard for the maintenance of the body and the improvement of the cities, they will be a shining light and perpetual source of joy to their brethren at home and to everyone else abroad.

Next comes this question—How does the West stand in truth in regard to what is called scientific progress ?

With the microscope, telescope, and the chemical-tube the man of Western science assays all things perceivable by the senses, turns into horse power the manifestations of nature, called of old " flesh," and utilises its brute forces either for the more rapid production and transport of commodities, or for the destruction of enemies by novel implements of warfare. The scope of Western science is thus limited, as in the case of the industrial arts, to that which relates to the body. Its methods of inquiry prevent it from the study of the invisible spirit. Though it recognises the fact that the visible came from the invisible, it declines to predicate anything of the invisible It says nothing of the spirit, or of the bondage of the spirit to darkness, or of the extrication of the spirit therefrom. It has no spiritual discernment. Indeed, it does not know what that expression means. It has not heard of, much less experienced, the fact that there are three kinds of knowledge available ; firstly, what the spirit knows through the senses ; secondly, what it knows through the deductions of the mind ; and thirdly, what it knows directly, withoute th

intervention of the senses or the mind. Western science is ignorant of the distinction between worldly knowledge and godly knowledge. Worldly knowledge consists of the reports of the senses and the inferences of the mind; and godly knowledge consists of what the soul only can know *when it stands isolate*—as most assuredly it can by due culture—*from the senses and the mind.* Western science is wholly ignorant of this isolation or alone-becoming of the soul, so well known to sanctified sages, and called by them in Sanskrit *Kaivalyam. Santi. Ekatvam,* and in Greek *Monogeneia.* Ignorant of the absolute existence of the invisible spirit and of its capacity to know God during isolation, and to know the world in combination with the senses and the mind, and obliged by the particular methods of inquiry which Western science has imposed upon itself, it disowns the spirit, the most real thing in the universe. There is no justification in truth for remaining in this state of agnosticism and continuing to be an ally of atheism. If it would only step out of its narrow sense-plane and study under proper guidance the deep-lying truths of the larger soul-plane, called the kingdom of the spirit, as assiduously as it has studied the secrets of the kingdom of nature, what a change would there be in the heart of all Europe! It would pass from carnal-mindedness, and that bondage of the intellect to the senses which is complacently called rationalism, to spiritual-mindedness, poise, and love of God Its cities would be abodes of righteousness and peace, and not of selfishness, strife, and gnawing desire. Then, indeed, should we speak of the glories of scientific progress.

And now of political progress.

In the East the populace admit that, owing to want of means and leisure, they are obliged to forego the advantages of learning and culture save in exceptional cases. Respecting the law as the doctrine of neighbourly love enforced by the government of the country, they mind their own business, and rely patiently and trustfully on the guidance of their spiritual teachers and the

consideration of the wealthy and the learned. who are themselves not unmindful of the spirit. This ideal of living in the world, not for the pampering of the senses but for the purification of the spirit and for its development in love and true knowledge, necessarily involves not only a genuine obedience to the law and to every constituted authority, such as parent, teacher, employer, magistrate, and other rulers of the people, but also a constant desire to practice forbearance on the part of both the rulers and the ruled. In these circumstances the word "Government" does not mean one body of people domineering over another body, but all classes of minds governing themselves by the dictates of neighbourly love as interpreted by time-honoured customs.

The early history of man proves that social relationships originally rested on consanguinity, common language, and common worship, and that any new question which did not come within the purview of an existing custom had to be decided by the unanimous consent of all the heads of families which formed the brotherhood In the West also this rule of unanimity prevailed in ancient times in the settlement of public questions, and a survival of it in the present day may be seen in trial by jury. But the ties of blood, language, and worship, which conduce to unity of sentiment and action. become ineffective for that end when foreign ideals have been allowed to take root in the minds of the people. The introduction of strange principles in a homogeneous community leads to the suppression or modification of established modes of thought and the espousal of new opinions. In this conflict of thought it is impossible to determine questions affecting the welfare of the mixed people by the rule of unanimity, which is founded on love. A new rule was necessary for the adjustment of differences arising in a polity composed of heterogeneous masses and interests, and the rough and ready rule of majority, based on the force of members, was chosen. The two rules are different in kind. Unanimity involves mutual concession, but the majority in

agreement means the rejection of the wishes of the minority. The former rule gives satisfaction all round and broadens love in the heart; but the latter quenches love and breeds resentment in the party defeated. To persons who prize the spiritual qualities of self-effacement, patience, and forbearance, the rule of majority is positively unholy, desecrating; but it looks natural to those who are not spiritual-minded, and to those who have backslidden from spirituality to secularity. And what is meant by the secularisation of politics? A polity which lives for this world only, and is ever in a hurry to wield power and secure for itself the perishable things of sensuous life by short cuts, esteeming it a virtue to be self-assertive, and to bawl, hustle, and smash in order to have its own way against the cherished desires and needs of others, is said to be "secularised."

Political progress in the West means nothing more than the victories of majorities over minorities inparliament, diet, or senate. It does not mean a series of well-chosen measures for the development of righteousness and the expansion of love in the individual. Many of the triumphs of majorities have indeed abated or suppressed tyranny and other forms of abuse of political power, but who can tell how many blessings have been lost to the world by the defeat of minorities? It is usual to speak highly of the Reform Act of 1832, but for some years past it has been seen to be the means by which the government of the empire is passing into the hands of common labourers, and the cause of many a coming storm in the sea of socialism. Some fifty years earlier than the Reform Act happened the French Revolution, which secured for the masses with it called "political equality." The true meaning of this expression is little known. It denotes the idea that one human body is as good as another, that the body of a prime minister is no better than that of his coachman or footman. It ignores the deeper truth that minds in human bodies are really of different orders of intelligence and ability, and that therefore it is wrong, in the nature of things, to invest one order of minds

with the work which is suitable only to another order. In a family it is the parents who must rule, because their minds see further and are less influenced by currents of selfishness or other disturbing factors than the minds of their children. Even so, in the Government of a polity, it is the most enlightened and capable minds that should be entrusted with the power of directing its affairs. It is ruinous in the highest degree to invite the unlearned, the fickle, the impatient, and the irascible, who form the majority of the world, either to rule the country or to elect representatives for that purpose. Only those who are behind the scenes know the ingenious, costly, and difficult contrivances by which the evils and dangers of popular government are sought to be minimised or averted,—by which the enfranchised populace are attempted to be "snared and taken" by a comparatively small body of men who are actuated by public spirit, or who believe themselves to be fit to guide the people and represent their interests in parliament. The work of teaching the people the nature of the public questions as they rise from time to time, and the work of carrying them safely to the poll, involve most anxious thought, strenuous labour, and heavy expenditure of money on the part of this small body of men, who employ thousands of agents to go among, and convert, the people. Thus arises the enthralling game of politics in the West. The aim of each player is to make his party take up his cry, and the aim of each party is to make the majority of the people take up that cry. When that is achieved, the ruling ministers who form the Government are expected to give effect to the wishes of the majority by legislative enactment or executive order; and if they do not, they should resign office and make room for another ministry. In this wise is maintained the never-ending political drama. It is exciting, and often amusing, and is commonly believed to be a struggle for the liberty of the people.

"The great characteristic of modern politics," said Mr. W. E. H. Lecky, "is the struggle for political liberty in its widest sense—the desire to make the will of the people the basis of the

Government—the conviction that a nation has a right to alter a government that oppose its sentiment." But surely the will of the people is not the will of a little more than half its number; nor can the liberty of the majority, which involves the slavery of the minority, be justly called political liberty. It is this strange medley of freedom and bondage which stands proudly in the West for political progress. One of its worst features is that the middle and the cultured classes, who form the most sensible part of the nation, are without political power owing to their smallness in number. "They have as little power now," said Mr. Walter Bagehot, "as they had before 1832; and the only difference is that before 1832 they were ruled by those richer than themselves, and now they are ruled by those poorer." If they desire for legislative or Municipal power, they must woo and win the populace in the way the latter like, and that way is the profane way that sickens the gentle and the righteous.

It is not difficult now to see true meaning of the saying that we are living in an age of progress. It simply means we are living in an age which, for want of proper judgment and poise, believes in change of any kind as a sure remedy for the tedium of work and idleness, and whose appetite is therefore keenly set on all those mechanical improvements which have been invented from day to day for facilitating business or amusement. Such an age, having no adequate conception of the evils ef luxury or of the greatness of work for its own sake, takes no pains to restrain the senses when they distract the mind, or to abate the play of the imagination as a means of conserving one's energy. It does not know the truth that sensuousness unfits the mind for its proper work of uplifting the soul. It claims to make us better to-day than we were yesterday, and to make us better to-morrow than we are to-day; but that is only better in food, raiment, wealth, household furniture, equipage, social position, and rank,—to be better in all that relates to the glorification of the perishable body, but not in anything that conduces to the purity of the eternal spirit. In this

betterment of the body, the poor are striving hard to keep pace with the middle classes, the middle classes with the richer classes, the rich man with the millionaire, and the millionaire with the multi-millionaire. This feverish desire to earn more and spend more on the feeding and dressing of the body, and supplying it and the senses with every object of gratification, is robbing all classes of the people, from the highest to the lowest, of that peace of mind and poise which are essential to the safety of the body, as well as of the spirit. The nervous restlessness which characterises life in Western cities is not the mark of true progress or sound civilisation. This is felt to be so by the cultured few in those very cities, who are puzzled and amazed at the "up-to-date" craze, which is slowly but surely quenching the spirit, and so ruining the most valnable asset alike of the individual and the nation.

It is folly to call this wide expansion of sensuonsness and worldliness an Age of Progress. Sages declare that cities get filled with the rural population when love of finery and amusement dominate the minds of the people. The flight of the peasantry from agricultural holdings into towns, known already to be too full of the unemployed and unemployable, is like the rush of insects into a bonfire lit in a tropical night, and affords positive proof that the spread of sensuous ideals is breaking up the very foundations of society. The steady backsliding of every class into deeper depths of worldliness, irreligion, and frivolity, is utterly inconsistent with true progress of true civilisation, by which is meant the ideas and practices which consciously uplift a nation from the corruptions of sensuousness and unrighteousness to a higher plane of life, where reverence for the spirit and its careful extrication from the mazes of worldliness are the chief aims of human endeavour.

Reprinted with the kind permission of Mr. P. Ramanathan.

CAMEOS FROM TAMIL LITERATURE.

I

THE LOVE-SICK LOVER.

The Maid :

'O Lady fair as the lovely peacock.
With speckled bosom and bright forehead,
With lovely locks fragrant with buds and haunted by clouds,
With beautiful navel, and hip blinding the seer,
And arms adorned with curving ornaments.

O'Lady fair with laughing eyes, lo what this man is about !
He bows to you, and tells me that it is not just to womanhood
To let a man suffer deadly pain from sight
Of so much incomparable beauty.
He cries his eyes out and trembles, as one
Bereft of manhood equal to meeting a raging elephant
And melts in heart completely broken.

The Lady. You seem well to merit the status *
Of the Benares citizen, by concerning yourself
With this stranger in the street, and his causeless distress.

The Maid : O Lady fair with budding bosoms and lovely ornaments,
The trouble caused by your eyes will cost him his life.
Unless you bless him with the panacea for his malady,
Lo, he beseeches you for the gift of your face,

---

* The allusion is to the belief that the people of Benares are so filled with love, that take on the sorrows of others as their own.

Unless you show him grace, of what avail, any other remedy;
O my beauty! what are we to do.

The Lady: We shall make gold!
Devoid of decorum, he openly declares his love in the street,
To test his truth, it is easy, shall we say.

The Maid: A man can but die, it is easy indeed.

The Lady: You guess, he does not die so easy;
He courts scandal publicly and recklessly,
He could not possess good breeding or sense of shame or decorum.

The Maid: But know you not, out of love for you, he has lost sleep,
And all modesty has fled before his thirst after your love.

This piece is remarkable for the sound sense and fine wit displayed by the *Nayaki*. The maid in describing the lady as wondrous fair, would insinuate that she and not he was to be blamed for his distress.

Kali II. 24,

II.

THE LOVER'S CRUELTY.

The Maid addresses the Lover.
O My Lord, of great equestrian fame,
When the ignorant undeterred by their
Own mind or the presence of others perform

II. 24. Kalitogai.

சுணங்கணிவனமுலைச்சுடர்கொண்டநறுநுதல்
மணங்கமழ்நறுங்கோதைமாரிவீழிருங்கூந்தல்
நுணங்கெழிலொண்டித்திநுழைநொசிமடமருங்குல்
வணங்கிறைவரிமுன்கைமயிலியன்மடநல்லாய்;

கண்ணார்ந்தநலத்தாரைக்கதுமெனக்கண்டவர்க்
குண்ணின்றநோய்மிகவுயிரெஞ்சுதுயர்செய்தல்,
பெண்ணன்றுபுனையிழாய்எனக்கூறித்தொழூஉம்
தொழுதே, கண்ணுநீராகநடுங்கினன் இன்னகாய்
என்செய்தான்கொல்லோவிஃதொத்தன்கட்
பொருகளிறன்னதகைசாம்பியுள்ளுள்
உருகுவான்போலுமுடைந்து.

தெருவின்கண்காரணமின்றிக்கலங்குவாக்கண்டுநீ
வாரணவாசிப்பதம்பெயர்த்தல்ஏதில
நீநின்மேற்கொள்வதெவன்

அலர்முலையாயிழைநல்லாய்கதுமெனப்
பேரமருண்கண்என்றோழியுறீஇய
வாரஞரெவ்வமுயிர்வாங்கும்
மற்றிந்நோய்தீருமருந்தருளாயொண்டொடி.

நின்முகங்காணுமருந்தினேனென்னுமால்
நின்முகந்தான்பெறினல்லதுகொன்னே
மருந்துபிறிதியாதுமில்லேற்றிருந்திழாய்
என்செய்வாம்கொல்லினிநாம்.

பொன்செயவாம்;

ஆறுவிலக்கித்தெருவின்கணின்றொருவன்
கூறுஞ்சொல்வாயெனக்கொண்டதன்பண்புணராம்;
தேறலெளிதென்பாநாம்.

ஒருவன்சாமாறெளிதென்பாமற்று.

சிறிதாங்கேமாணாவு,ரம்பல்அலரின்அலர்கென
நாணுநிறையுநயப்பில்பிறப்பிலி.

V. 8. Kalitogai.

பூணுகநோக்கியிமையான்நயந்துநங்
கேண்மைவிருப்புற்று அவனையெதிர்நின்று
நாண்நடப்பெயர்த்தநயவாவின்றே.

கண்டவரில்லெனவுலகத்துள் உணராதார்
தங்காதுதகைவின்றித்தாம்செய்யும்வினைகளுள்
நெஞ்சறிந்தகொடியவைமறைப்பினும் அறிபவர்
நெஞ்சத்துக்குறுகியகரியில்லையாகலின்
வண்பரிநவின்றவயமான்செல்வ
நன்கதையறியினுநயனில்லாநாட்டத்தால்
அன்பிலையெனவந்துகழறுவல்ஐயகேள்.

மகிழ்செய்தேமொழித்தொய்யில்சூழ் இனமுலை
முகிழ்செய்மூழ்கியதொடர்பவன் உண்கண்
அவிழ்மணியுறைப்பவுநல்காதுவிடுவாய்
இமிழ்திரைக்கொண்ககொடியைகாணீ.

இலங்கேர்எல்வளையேர்தழைதைஇ
நலஞ்செலநல்கியதொடர்பவன்சாஅய்ப்
புலந்தழப்புல்லாதுவிடுவாய்
இலங்குநீர்ச்சேர்ப்பகொடியைகாணீ.

இன்மணிச்சிலம்பின்சின்மொழிஐம்பால்
பின்னெடுகெழி இயதடவாவாக
நுண்ணெழில்வாடவாராதுவிடுவாய்
தண்ணந்துறைவதகாஅய்காணீ.

எனவாங்கு.

அனையனென்றளிவதிபெருமநின்னின்று
இறைவரைநில்லாவளையவள்இவட்கினிப்
பிறையேர்சுடர்நுதட்பசலை
மறையச்செல்லுநீமணந்தனைவிடினே.

An ignoble act, feeling there was no one
To see it, and try to conceal it from others
Even then, there is no surer witness than their own conscience.
So, even when I know this well, out of my
Foolishness, I declare to you your faithlessness. Hear !
You forget the pleasure you derived from her
Lovely embrace and sweet words in her youth.
You see her eyes now shed tears of sorrow and do not reach her side.
O Lord of the sea ! You see you are cruel indeed !
You gloated on her personal charms increasing day by day in her youth ;
You see her cry and allow her beauty to wither away and do not reach her side !
O Lord of the sea, you see you are cruel indeed !
You played with her locks and was pleased with the sound of her voice and her tinkling feet.
You allow her beauty to fade and do not reach her side.
O Lord of the Sea ! You see you are cruel indeed !
O My Lord. This her condition is. Grant your love.
She, where bangles fall off for want of support
Will know no more shadow cross her face
If you will quickly go and embrace her.

Kali. V. 8.

Note.—This piece is especially noticeable as containing the working of conscience, in the Hindu mind. St. Tirumular has also a beautiful verse as follows. கண்காணி இல்லென்று கள்ளம் பகர்கின்றார்.

J. M. N.

THE ADWAITA ACCORDING TO SAIVA SIDDHANTA PHILOSOPHY.

by

Mr. J. M. Nallaswami Pillai, B.A., B.L.

(*Continued from page 77, Vol. IX.*)

We are sure that this is a perfectly safe position to hold and our object in penning this article is in no way to differ from this view ; only we fancy we have an *analogy* in Tamil, which will exactly answer the point and make the union more intelligible, besides bringing out the nature of mind and mattor, in a much more favourable light, than from the standpoint of a mere materialist, qualified or otherwise ; and we fancy we have been almost every day dis-using language to describe this union, though the name in itself is a *puzzle*, and embodies both a *paradox* and a *contradiction*. Before we state them however we will state one or two facts so far as they bear upon the relation of mind and matter, and which Dr. Bain states more fully in the "Mental Science." It is that all objectivity implies the subject-mind and at the same time. "All objective states are in a sense also mental." Unless the mind is present, though unconscious, you cannot have object knowledge at all. We cannot have a pure objective condition at all without the subject supporting it, as it were, though, for the time being, it is non-apparent, is entirely blotted out. (*Sunyam.*) Or rather shall we say, though dissimilar the mind has become thoroughly identified with matter. But mind can ascend to pure subjectivity and it does not imply the presence of objects, as the object does the subject ; and in such a pure subjective state, where is the object ? It has become also non-apparent (*Sunyam*). Regarding the possibility, however, of matter being the primary element, there is the fact. Matter is found both an organic and inorganic, and what a world of difference is there betweeu these

conditions of matter ? Is the peculiar organisation given to it by the presence for the time being of mind in it, or is it derived solely by its inherent power ? We have admitted that the so-called matter might possess potentialities without number. Still, is there any sort of similarity between the inorganic properties exhibited by matter and the organic or vital property ? However this be, we will now proceed to state our analogy. It is the analogy of vowels and consonants. We have quoted the Gita verse, but we look in vain even in Sankara's commentary for the meaning we have tried to give it. Possibly Sankara would not give such an explanation, as it would conflict with his preconceived theory. So if there was truth in it, it remained locked and the key altogether remained with the Siddhanta rights. The most familiar example of the analogy occurs in the sacred Kural in the very first words of it :

"அகர முதலவெழுத் தெல்லா மாதி
பகவன் முதற்றே யுலகு"

"As 'A' is the first of all letters, so the ancient Bagavan is the first in this world."

We might fancy an alphabet, in which the letter "A" is not the first, and if the point of comparison is merely to denote God's order in place as the first, so many other analogies might be thought of. And Parimelalagar accordingly notes that the order is not order in place but order in its origin. It is the most primary and first sound that the human voice can utter, and it is also the one sound which is present in every other sound, vowel or consonant. All other vowels are formed by modifications of this sound. And what are vowels and consonants, pray ? A vowel is defined as a sound that can be pronounced of itself, without the aid of any other sound. And a consonant is one which cannot be sounded except with the aid of the vowel. Let us look more carefully into the nature of these sounds. We every day utter these

sounds, and yet we fail to recognise the mystery in their connection, *solely* on account of their familiārity. We tried to utter "A." It comes pure and simple, by the mere opening of the mouth, without any modification whatever, and requires no other aid. But let us pronounce say "K." It is 'Ke' in English, in Tamil it is 'Ka' or 'Ik'! There is a vowel sound present in it, 'e' or 'a' or 'i.' Let us eliminate this vowel sound and try to pronounce the consonant. Well, the task is impossible, you don't get any consonant sound at all. In the consonant therefore there is always a vowel sound present, though we never consciously recognise its presence, though in Tamil the symbolism is so highly philosophical that we invariably mark its presence even when we write purely consonants. We dot all our consonants as 'க்', 'ச்,' etc, and the dot or circle represents in Hindu symbolism the letter 'A' This dot or circle begins almost every one of the twelve vowels in the Tamil alphabet. and as to what the other curved and horizontal and perpendicular lines mean we will take another opportunity to explain. When we write 'க்', therefore, the framers of the alphabet meant to represent how the vowel sound underlies the consonant and supports it and give it its very being and existence. Such a mark is necessary when we write the vowel-consonant 'ka,' 'க,' as we are fully aware of its presence. In the pure consonant therefore the vowel is implied and understood though for the time being its presence is not detected and it is completely identified with the consonant itself. We have been considering at learned length the nature of the union between mind and body, but have we ever paused to consider the nature of the union of the vowel and consonant? Is there any such unique conjunction anywhere else in nature, where one subsists not, except in conjunction with the other. Except the inseparable conjunction, as above stated, we see the consonant 'pure' is no more derived from the vowel than the vowel from the consonant. There is much wider contrast between these than between any two things in the world. The place of origin is distinct. 'A' is pronounced by the mere opening of the mouth. The tongue has to be brought in contact with the palate to pronounce 'k' and this same act cannot produce

the vowel. So the vowel cannot be said to cause the consonant, nor the consonant the vowel. Nor can we call the consonant and the connection themselves as false and as a mere illusion or delusion. So neither the principle of *Parinama* nor *Vivartana* can apply to this connection. All that we can say of it is that they are so connected and inseparable and that no language can be possible by vowels alone nor by consonants alone, and every consonant is at the same time a vowel-consonant, and though we can conceive of the vowels standing alone, to think of consonants as existing by themselves is an utter impossibility. Now apply all these to the case of mind and body. Mind is the vowel, and the body (matter) is the consonant. Mind and body are as widely contrasted as vowel and consonants are. One cannot be derived from the other by *Parinama* or *Vivartana*. Yet both are inseparably united and though the mind occupies an independent position, can be pure subject at times, the body cannot subsist.............unless it be in conjunction with mind. Mind is always implied in body; mind underlies it, supports it and sustains it (if all this language derived from material cognition is permissible). When the mind is pure mind, the body is not, it is *asat* (*Sunyam*). When it is pure body, mind is present but non-apparent, it has become one with the body. The mind is there but it conceals its very self, its very identity and it is as good as absent. And except at rare intervals, our whole existence is passed in pure objectivity, without recognising the presence of the true self, the mind. The whole truth of these two analogous cases, the only two, are brought out in Tamil in the most beautiful manner by the same words being used to denote vowel and consonant as also mind and mody. See what a light bursts when we name 'உயிர்,' மெய் (உடல்). The word 'உயிர்' means both a vowel and mind (soul); and 'மெய்' both body and consonant. Dr. Bain observes that the sense of similarity is the sense of invention and true discovery. The greatest discoveries in science have been made by catching such resemblances at rare intervals. And when the very first Tamil man called his

vowels and consonants 'உயிர்' 'மெய்' was he not a born philosopher and had he not comprehended the true nature of the union between mind and body and vowels and consonants. The simile receives its best exposition for the first time in the hands of St. Meikanda Deva (*vide* Sivagnanabotham, I. b and notes pp. 12, 19 and 20), and his followers (*vide* "Light of Grace," pp. 7 and 8); and St. Meikandan gives a name in the same verse for denoting this connection. This one word is *Advaita*. This word has been a real puzzle to many; and so many renderings of it have been given. The Tamil philosopher, however, explains it as meaning "ஒன்றாகாமல், இரண்டாகாமல், ஒன்றுமிரண்டு மின்றாகாமல்," (neither one nor two nor neither), and which fully and beautifully brings out, therefore, the meaning of Dr. Bain's words that the connection is both a *paradox* and a *contradiction*. Very few outside the circle of Siddhanta School could be made to comprehend the truth of this paradox, more so when their mind is prepossessed with the truth of their own views But we have always used the analogy of vowels and consonants with very great effect, and it has tended to make the subject much clearer than many a more-learned argument."

So that whatever word we may use, the nature of this relationship is clear. If the Vedic texts postulate oneness, it is in a higher sense than what is understood in the current philosphies. In this position is reached a higher and truer Monism. We have shown how true it is that St. Meikandan stated that there is no other letter but 'A.' So it is we can state 'There is nothing else but God,' 'Only One, without a second.' This comes as the result of the Highest experience or Gnana or Swanubhava or Sivanubhava. And this is stated in the central stanza of Tiruvachaka, its *Hridaya* sloka:

"இன்றெனக் கருளி இருள்கடிந் துள்ளத்
தெழுகின்ற ஞாயிறே போன்று
நின்ற நின்தன்மை நினைப்பற நினைந்தே

நீயலாற் பிறிது மற்றின்மை
சென்று சென்றணுவாய்த் தேய்ந்து தேய்ந்து ஒன்றாம்
திருப்பெருந் துறையுறை சிவனே—.
ஒன்று நீயல்லை யன்றி யொன்றில்லை
யாருன்னை யறியகிற் பாரே.

"This day in thy mercy unto me thou didst drive away the darkness and stand in my heart as the Rising Sun

Of this Thy way of rising—there being naught else but thou—I thought without thought.

I drew nearer and nearer to Thee, wearing away atom by atom, till there was only One

Oh Siva, Dweller in the great Holy Shrine

Thou art not aught in the universe, naught is there save Thou, Who can know Thee ?—(*from* P. A's *Translation*).

As man nears God, he wears away atom by atom, so that at the moment of union, nothing of him is left and what is left is the Presence of the Supreme One only and the feeling of His Presence; and no feeling of consciousness of feeling of himself or others. This feeling of the Presence and Bliss of God, is One and Advaita, and there is no consciousness of such oneness or Bliss, and duality will certainly arise the moment man regains consciousness. So what he is said to lose in fact atom by atom is his various conscious selves.

"வான்கெட்டு மாருதமாய்ந்து—அழல்நீர்மண்கெடினும்
தான்கெட்ட லின்றிச் சலிப்பறியாத் தன்மையனுக்கு
ஊன்கெட்டு உயிர்கெட்டு உணர்வுகெட்டென்உள்ளமும்போய்
நான்கெட்ட வாபாடித் தெள்ளேணங் கொட்டாமோ."

"Though Ether, Wind, Fire, Water, Earth should fail
His constant Being fails not, knows no weariness!

In Him, my body, soul, and thought and mind were merged (lost)
How all *myself* was lost, sing and beat—TELLENAM"
(*from* Rev. Doctor G. U. Pope's *Translation*).

His bodily consciousness, His life consciousness, His mental consciousness, all these alone constitute his individuality, the feeling of I and mine. This 'Iness' 'நான்' is what has got to be rid of. So that when this 'Iness' or individuality is lost, 'நான் கெட்டவா' he becomes Sivam or God, 'நான் கெட்டு சிவமானவா.' What perishes of course is the Soul's individuality or consciousness of Iness, inducing duality, but what subsists even in Moksha is tho soul's personality, which has Swanubhava or Sivanubhava, identifying itself with God.

The soul in union with God having become pure object (God) as it were, which is the true Monism of Science. Hence it is St. Meikandan states this paradox (XI. 2. c.)

" When becoming one with God, if the soul perished there will be nothing to unite with God, as it perishes. If it did not perish, it cannot become one with God. Just like the salt dissolved in water, the soul, after losing its mala, unites itself to His feet and becomes the servant of God (loses its 'Iness' or individuality.) Then it will have no darkness (as separation.") The salt in its crystaline conditions constitutes its individuality. In that condition it is distinguished from water. But after it is dissolved in water, what is lost is its individual character and not itself or its substance or personality.

The following sentence from a text-book of science will show how exact is our language : When a river enters the sea, it soon loses its *individuality*, it becomes *merged* with the body of the ocean, when it loses its current, and when therefore it has no power to keep in suspension the sediment which it had brought

down from the higher lands." If re-read as follows its application will become clear : " When the soul loses its individuality (feeling of Iness, Ahankaram or Anavam), it becomes merged in God, when it loses its Karama, and when therefore it has no power to keep in suspension its mala with which it was associated from the beginning." And this is the exact figure and language used by St. Meikandam in VIII. 4. A. This losing of self is the real sacrifice brought about by love. It is this sacrifice பலி we are asked to make as we enter the Temple, and the moment we make it, our பசுத்துவம் (nature of Pasu) will leave us, and we will become the *Nandi*, the Blissful Sivam.

That the Siddhanta marks the Highest Standard of Monistic Truth is what is brought out by St. Tirumular also in his famous line " தானான வேதாந்தம் தான் என்னும் சித்தாந்தம்" " Vedanta postulates 'Aham Brahmasmi,' 'I am Brahman,' Siddhanta postulates Tat (one) alone." That is to say that the Siddhanta appeals fully and finally to only One Experience, the Bliss of God and One alone ; whereas the Vedanta has reference to the Soham paths whereby this experience is gained. And anyone can perceive that the Soham experience is a conscious one and a dual one or Dvaita. In this sense Siddhanta is Advaita, and Vedanta is Dvaita. And what are considered as the strongholds of Vedanta by followers of Sankara admit of easy interpretation by the Siddhantis. The question, as pointed out by Sivagnana Yogi, did not arise absolutely as to whether padarthas were one or two. It arose in connection with the famous Mahavakya texts, 'Aham Brahmasmi,' Tatvamsi, etc. Says he :—

மற்றென்னையோ அத்துவிதமென்னும் சொற்குப் பொருளெனிற் சித்தாந்த சைவருரைக்குமாறு காட்டுதும், 'அது நீயாகின்றாய், எ-ம், அது நானாகின்றேன், எ-ம், 'அதுவிது வாகின்றது. எ-ம், மூவிடம் பற்றி நிகழும் தத்துவமசி முதலிய மகாவாக்கியங்களைக் கேட்டவழி அதுவென்பது ஒருபொருள், நீயென்பது ஒருபொருளாகலின், ஒருபொ

ருள் மற்றொருபொருளாமாறி யாங்ஙனம் என்றும் ஐய நீக்குதற்கு எழுந்ததாகலின் அதுவிதுவாதற் கேதுவாய், அவ்விரண்டிற்கு முளதாகிய சம்பந்தவிசேட முணர்த்துதலே யத்துவிதமென்னும் சொற்குப்பொருளென்றுணர்ந்துகொள்க.

"If you ask what then is the meaning of the word *Advaitam* I will show how Saiva Siddhantis explain it. On hearing the great texts called Mahavakya, 'Tatvamasi, etc., which are used in the three persons, we see that these sentences speak of 'that' as one substance and 'Thou' as another, and inquire how one can become the other. The answer is given to remove this doubt, by stating *how one can be the other and what relation subsists between these two,* and the word Advaitam is used to express this peculiar relation."

The word does not mean one or non-existence of two or more, but is used to express the peculiar relation that exists between two distinct things and which can become one, and we had long ago called attention to this meaning in our very first work and before we had any chance of seeing this luminous exposition of Sivagnana Yogi, and we observed, *vide* Sivagnanabotham p. 17 :

"Though in all these cases an identity is perceived, a difference in substance is also felt. It is this *relation* which could not be easily postulated in words but which may perhaps be conceived, and which is seen as two (Dvaitam) and at the same time as not two (Advaitam), it is this relation which is called *Advaitam,* 'a unity in duality,' and the philosophy which postulates it the "Advaita philosophy."

Of all the mass of the Vedic and Theosophic literature that has come into existence during the last two or three decades, there is none that equal the writings of Professor Kunte for real insight into the nature of Hindu philosophy and critical acumen. And his summary added at the end of the first paragraph of the first Adhyaya of his translation of the Brahma Sutras is a most beautiful

and original one. Wonderful as it may seem, both Sivagnana Yogi and Kunte exactly propound the same questions and give the same answer. He shows there are texts in the Upanishads which support the dualistic and monistic view, and the mainstay of the monists are the *Maha* Vakya texts and these texts are the great stumbling block in the path of dualists, and he shows that their interpretation cannot bear an examination. because the texts evidently do not admit of it, and all that they say is simply beside the mark.

" What is to be done ? There are doubtless a few texts in the Veda which support the Pantheistic views. Most however support the Theistic principles. But so long as Pantheistic texts are not explained, the propostion that the Vedas do not teach Pantheism cannot be accepted. Again, the adjustment and the interpretation proposed by the Theists cannot be accepted because of their being far-fetched and forced. But we do not see how the few Pantheistic texts come in the way of Theism because we believe that though they be interpreted as the Pantheists do, yet they support Theism. How can this be ?" And he proceeds to show how this can only be understood in the light of Yoga. After instancing the various forms of Bhakti (Chariya and Kriya), he says : " But there is a special feature of such adoration—a feature not included in any of these. It is the ecstatic condition of the spirit, a condition which can neither be explained nor understood without an illustration. Let the reader realize the love a mother has for her child. A mother or her child sometimes experiences a state of mind, an indescribable state. That which either of them expresses can alone convey an idea of their feelings when they are in the ecstatic condition. The mother directly addresses the child thus, ' Oh, my piece of gold, Oh, my soul, Oh, my life, can I eat you up ?" " தின்பன் கடிப்பன திருத்துவன் தானே." Under these circumstances, the mother forgets that her body is different from that of her child, which experiences the same feeling. Such an

identity is the form of the ecstatic condition of the mind. This is a special feature of adoration. This sort of *ecstatic identity the Yogis feel*. Hence in the Veda and in the Upanishads, the Pantheistic doctrine of the identity of the human spirit and the Supreme Spirit, *if enunciated is enunciated in this way*. Again the Brahma Sutra of Badarayana does not inculcate it." And he explains further below. "The characteristic feature of the Indian Vedanta is its recognition of spirit power, as it is explained in the Yoga Sutras which systematically lay down the following propositions: That the Supreme Spirit, or God is *related* to the human spirit, that the human spirit has very great *potential powers* and that if certain methods of living be adopted, it can call out its powers and become actually able to know the past and the future, and that the spirit disenthralled from the flesh is ultimately absorbed in one sense into the Supreme Spirit. The Yoga system is properly the backbone of the Vedanta"

And we had pointed out in another place, Vol. II, page 199, that the Yoga *Pada* is not merely the backbone of Vedanta, but it is Vedanta itself.

It is not well understood that the word Upanishad really means the same thing as 'Yoga.' Yoga means the Sadana required for bringing the Soul and God in Union; and the Upanishad is also the teaching of the Sadana whereby man come nearer and nearer to God, by destroying the bonds that bind him. The root-meaning (upa—near, ni—quite, sad—to perish) is hit off to a nicety in the famous line in Thiruvachakam quoted above. "The house of God," 7th verse, சென்று சென்று அணுவாய்த் தேய்ந்து தேய்ந்து ஒன்றும், "nearer and nearer to Thee I drew, wearing away atom by atom, till I was one with Thee." And in the passage in (Chandog, I. 1 10) and in several others, the word Upanishad is used as a synonym for Yoga. And this derivation really explains the scope of an Upanishad, a misunderstanding of which has led to no end of confusion. The Siddhanti takes the Upanishad as the text-book of the Yoga Pada or School.

The higher stage or Pada being the Gnana Pada. the words Upanishad, Vedanta, Yoga, Saha-Marga or Sohamarga or Hamsa Marga are all synonymous ; and as Vedanta strictly means Yoga, the words Vedanta and Siddhanta are contrasted, Siddhanta meaning the Gnana Marga or Pada, though it embraces all the remaining Padas, Chariya, Kriya and Yoga. The practice involved in the Mahavakya texts is this Soham Bavana or Sivoham Bhavana, and when this practice is matured, the soul stands in complete allegiance to the Supreme One, renouncing all idea of self and self-action, then can the soul say : "I am all the world," யானே யுலகென்பனின்று Sivagnanabotham. 2-1-4. "In me everything originated, in me everything established, in me everything merges. That secondless-Brahman am I (Kaival. Up. 21.)

As Professor Kunte speaks of the *potential power of man* by calling out which he can become one with God, Sivagnana Yogi dwells at great length and too frequently, on this special characteristic or power of man whereby man can be said to become God ; and this power is the power of the soul *to become that to which it is united*, அது அதுவாதல், in the language of St. Meikandan, சார்ந்ததன் வண்ணமாதல் in the language of St. Arul Nandi Sivacharya, and யாதொன்று பற்றின் அதன் மியல்பாய் நிற்று in the language of St, Thayumanavar, and this power is likened to that of the crystal or mirror.

Says Professor Henry Drummond :–

" All men are mirrors—that is the first law on which this formula (of sanctification or conception) is based. One of the aptest descriptions of a human being is that he is a mirror." This illustration is to be originally found in the Upanishads aad Gita.

" As a metal disk (mirror) tarnished by dust shines bright again after it has been cleansed, so the one incarnate person satisfied and free from grief after he has seen the real nature o

himself. "And when by real nature of himself, he sees as by a lamp, the real nature of the Brahman, then having become the unborn eternal God who transcends all taloos, he is freed from all pasa." (Svetas Upanishad ii. 14, 15). "From meditating Him (abid yanath), from joining Him (yoganath), from becoming one with Him (latvablhavat), there is further cessation of all Maya in the end." (Svetas Upanishad i. 10.) "As a flame is enveloped by smoke, as a mirror *by dust*, as an embryo is wrapped by the womb, so this (soul) is enveloped by it (desire). (Gita iii. 3.)

And St. Meikandan has this stanza (viii. 3. a.) பன்னிறமே The principle of it receives its exposition in the Samkhya and in the Yoga Sutras, by means of this illustration of mirrors and colours.

"Though it (soul) be unassociated, still there is a tinging reflectionally) through non-discrimination (for there is not a real tinge in that which is unassociated (with tincture or anything else, still there is as it were a tinge ; hence the tinge is treated simply as reflection by those who discriminate the tinge from the soul which it delusively seems to belong to).

"As is the case with the Hibiscus and the crystal there is not a tinge, but a fancy that there is such." Sankhya aphorism—vi. 27-28—Gable's *translation.*

In the words of Professor Max Muller, this is how the subject is treated in the Yoga Sutras : "Now if we ask what is the result of all this, we are told in Sutra 41, that a man who has put an end to all the motions and emotions of his mind, obtains with regard to all objects of his senses conformation grounded on them, or steadiness and consubstantiation. the idea being that the idea is modified or changed by the objects perceived (அது அதுவாதல்) (i. 41). As a crystal when placed near a red flower, becomes really red to our eyes, in the same way the mind is tinged by the objects perceived" (Six Systems. p. 453).

This principle of mind identifying itself with the objects perceived, is stated in the following passages of the Upanishad also.

"Now a man is like this or that, according as he acts and according as he behaves, so will he be : a man of good acts will become good, a man of bad acts bad. He becomes pure by pure deeds, bad by bad deeds.

"As is his desire, so is his will ; and as is his will, so his deed. Whatever deeds he does, that he will reap.

"Whatever object man's own mind is attached to, to that he goes strenuously with his deed.

"He who desires the Ātman, being Brahman, he goes to Brahman. That atma is indeed Brahman." (Brihadar IV. iv. 5, 6.)

Similar passages are found in the Mahabarata and the familiar statement of it in Sanskrit is!

'*Yat Bhavam tat Bhavati.*'

Herbert Spencer calls this union as one of absolute identity. And this is almost the language used by St. Meikandan. 'அது அது ஆதல்' As the Upanishad writers, Sankhyans, and Yogins, and Siddhantis state this principle and base on it their scheme of salvation, so does also Professor Henry Drummond in his remarkable address entitled "The Changed Life," based on the text from St. Paul.—*The New Reformer.*

(*To be Continued.*)

ON GOD SUBRAMANIAN.

A NOTE.

In the Deepika of the October, page 84 the Vedanta interpretation of God *Subramaniar* is stated to be *Atmagnana.* The Siddhanta explanation of the God is as follows :—

Prior to creation the souls lie in their *Kevala* state, suffering from the effects of Mala—God's love is then excited and He wills to save them and manifests Himself as Sadasivanayanar with Isana, Thathpuruda, Agora, Vamadeva and Sadryojata as His 5 faces or Saktis in the spiritual or Arupa plane. In addition to these 5, He has also His Arul Sakti who is the root of all these and is known as Vinayagar. By the power of the 5 saktis, the 5 Moorthis—Sadasiva, Maheswara, Rudra, Vishnu and Brahma perform each one of the 5 functions in the 4 material planes and the one between the material and spiritual planes. These 5 murthis and the Arul Sakthi of God constitute Subramaniar. This is explained in the following lines of *Thiruchendur* Agaval :—

தாரகவெழுத்துஞ் சார்பெழுத்தைந்தும்,
வாரணமுகவன், மலரோன், திருமால்,
வருத்தமியுருத்திரன், மகேசுரன், சதாசிவன்,
உருத்தெளிந்திட நம்முருவேயாகும்
ஆறுமாமுகமா யமர்ந்தது மிதுவே.

In Kantharkalivenba, this is referred to as follows :—

ஐந்து முகத்தோடதோ முகமும் தந்து
திருமுகங்க ளாறுக்கி.

The Asura or Rakshasa confining the souls is the Mala—Vanavar is the soul which is a Vibbu in its r eal state and is made

Anu by the Rakshāsa or Mala. St. Thirumular speaks of God haviug sent out Subramaniar to kill the Asura as follows :—

எம்பெருமா னிறைவா முறையோ வென்று
வம்பவிழ் வானோ ரசுரன் வலிசொல்ல
வம்பவளமேனி யறுமுகன் போயவர்
தம்பகை கொல்லென்ற தற்பரன்றானே.

The 6 material planes where the souls, by Thapas gain experience and wisdom step by step, are known as 6 Adarahs. We have to pass through these planes before reaching the spiritual plane or Niradara. This is explained in Thiruvunthiar as follows :—

ஆதாரத்தாலே நிராதாரத்தே சென்று
மீதானத்தே செல்கவுந்தீபற
விமலற்கிடமா தென்றுந்தீபற.

As we gain wisdom in these material planes with the help of the *6* deities collectively constituting Snbramaniar, before we reach the feet of God in the spiritual plane, Subramaniar is stated by St. Thirumular as having been born or appeared before God who is His father :—

எந்தைபிரானுக் கிருமூன்று வட்டமாய்த்
தந்தைதன்முன்னே ஷண்முகன் தோன்றலாற்
கந்தன்சுவாமி கலந்தங் கிருத்தலான்
மைந்தனிவனென்ன மாட்டிக்கொளீரே.

The twice three circles referred to are the 6 Adaras or planes with the 6 deities performing their functions there or Subramaniar.

In my Anda Pinda samathwamsakthi I have given an explanation of this.

The sounds of crackers used in the month of Aipasi denote the destruction of Asura or Mala and the illumination in the following month is the Gnana Joti resulting from the purification of the souls. The Sakthis of Subramaniar are Valliammai and Daivayanai. The former is said to have been born of a மான் and brought up by Vedars. This is Prakrithi one of the Sakthis of the supreme being—Daivayanai is said to be the daughter of Devendra and brought up by Ayiravatham. This is Bhindu Sakthi or Kundali or Pranava. That these two are the spouses of Subramaniar simply means that by means of these two Sakthis the God removes the Anavamala of the souls and imparts gnanam.

C. S. SUNDRAM MUDALIAR.

THE RELATIONS OF ART AND RELIGION IN INDIA.

by

Ananda K. Coomaraswamy. D. Sc.* (*Abstract*).

Three outstanding phases of the relation of art to religion are recognisable : art in the service of religion (religious art) ; art rejected by religion (asceticism) ; and art despised by religion (puritanism). The first two of these positions are properly characteristic of Hinduism and Buddhism, the third of Islam. The possibility of reconciling the two first is found in the fact that Hinduism does not seek to lay down for all men, or for all parts of a man's life, the same course of action, or point to one only method of spiritual progress and means of salvation.

Indian art is essentially religious and aims at the intimation of Divinity. But the Infinite and Unconditioned cannot be expressed

* See also A. K. Coomaraswamy, The Aims of Indian Art, Campden, 1908.

in finite terms ; hence the religious art of India is concerned with the representation of personal divinities. For most men the love and service of a personal deity is their religion ; and it is their faith that Indian religious art expresses. These are the true citizens, for whom art is an aid to and a means of spiritual progress ; 'fine art' an intimation of the Infinite ; the 'lesser arts' a witness that man does not live by bread alone. True asceticism, on the other hand, is a search for a reality beyond conditioned life.

Turning to the actual religious art of India, we find that it expresses in concrete imagery ideas that belong to the transcendental and mystic aspects of religion. Indian religious art contrasts thus with Greek, which corresponds only to the Olympian aspect of Greek religion. There are many Greek statues that may be either athletes or Apollos. In Indian religious art, on the contrary, the human form is used not for the sake of its own perfection, but to express transcendental conceptions ; the ideal, non-human, and sometimes grotesque character of Hindu images is always deliberate and intentional. Nature is a veil, not a revelation ; art is to be something more than a mere imitation of this *maya*.

Almost the whole philosophy of Indian art is summed up in the verse of Sukracharya's *Sukranitisara*, which enjoins upon the imager the method of meditation :

'In order that the form of an image may be brought fully and clearly before the mind, the image maker should meditate ; and his success will be in proportion to his meditation. No other way—not indeed seeing the object itself—will achieve his purpose.'

The method of concentration in religious devotion upon the mental image of an Ishta Devata, or patron deity, is identical with the method of evoking and defining mental images practised by the imager or painter.

This is illustrated by the comparison of Dhyana *mantrams* with verses from the technical books of images (*Silpa sastras*).

The use of images in worship is generally misunderstood by students who belong to more or less puritanical religions. The Hindu view, not unlike the Catholic, is somewhat as follows: Except for those whose heart is set on an immediate realisation of a non-mayic, unconditioned state of existence as subject without object, images are of value as a centre of thought. Images obviously made with hands are often less likely to create misconceptions than purely mental concepts of divinity—they are more, or at least not less, obviously symbols, and are thus less liable to be regarded as an adequate representation of the Infinite. The educated image worshipper knows that the very name of God, and the attribution of qualities to Him, are limitations imposed by his own intellect; still more that the form of the image is not really the form of the god, but only analogous with a coloured glass held before the sun.

Religious symbolism in Indian art is of two kinds; the concrete symbolism of attributes, and the symbolism of gesture, sex, and physical pecularities. The symbolism of gesture includes the various positions of the hands known as *mudras*; of physical pecularities the third eye of Siva or the elephant head of Ganesa are instances The subject of sex-symbolism is generally misinterpreted; but, in fact, the imagery drawn from the deepest emotional experiences is a proof both of the power and truth of the art and the religion. India has not feared either to use sex-symbols in its religious art, or to see in sex itself an intimation of the Infinite.*

The *lingam* is not properly an instance of sex-symbolism; it is probably not of phallic origin, but derived from the stupa, and is now regarded as the highest emblem of Siva, because the least anthropomorphic. True sex-symbolism in Indian art of literature assumes two main forms: the conception of the relation of the soul

* Brihadaranyaka Upanishad, 4. 3. 21; also 1. 4. 3-4.

to God expressed in terms of the passionate adoration of a woman for her lover ; and the representation of the energic power (*sakti*) of a divinity as a feminine divinity.

With regard to the use of sex-symbolism in Indian art there may be quoted here the words nsed by Sir Monier Williams in referring to the presence of words of erotic significance in his Sanskrit Dictionary : 'in India the rela ion between the sexes is regarded as a sacred mystery, and is never held tc be suggestive of improper or indecent ideas.' As much could not be said of Europe.

Indian religious art is often, but by no means always, beautiful ; it may also be terrible or grotesque. Personal gods are aspects of a pantheistic Divinity, upon whom 'all this universe is strung as gems upon a thread.' But nature is not always smiling ; she is concerned not less with death than life. As there are three gunas or qualities in nature, *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*, images are also classified into three, sattvik, rajasik and tamasik.

But it is best to study the relation between religion and art from actual examples. The seated Buddha may be selected as an example of one of the traditional conceptions of Indian religious art. Here conventionality and tradition are commonly held to fetter artistic imagination. But it is a modern error to associate imaginative intensity only with novelty. For, to the nameless artists who wrought the religious sculptures of India, the aim was not to prove their own cleverness, but to retell the great thing itself, which meant so much to them, and which it was given to them continually to re-express. As regards the Buddha, it is not true, as is sometimes said, that there is no development, in the sense that the work of different epochs is quite uncharacterised. But it is true that the conception remains throughout almost identical. This is an expression of the fact that the Indian ideal has not changed. What is this ideal so passionately desired ? It is one-pointedness, same-sightedness, control : little by little to rein in, not merely the sense, but the mind. Only by constant labour and passionlessness is this peace to be attained. What is the attitnde of mind and body of one that seeks it ? He shall be seated like the image ; for that postnre once acquired, is one of perfect bodily equipoise : 'so shall he sit that is under the rule, given ever unto Me. In this wise the *yogi* . . . comes to the peace that ends in nirvana and that abides in Me.' How then

should the greatest of India's teachers be represented otherwise than in this posture that is in India associated with every striving after the great Ideal ?

One other point connected with statues of the Buddha may be referred to. It relates to the statues of Dhyani Buddhas. The earthly mortal Buddha is sometimes regarded as merely a projection or partial incarnation (amsah) of a pure and glorious being functioning on some finer, more ideal plane. A statue of a Dhyani Buddha stands for this pure being, not merely for the man as he appeared on earth. The idea belongs to the Hindu conception of partial incarnation. Such conceptions were not unknown to the founders of the great traditions of Indian art ! and it is this fact which gives so much depth and seriousness not merely to their work, but even to the last monuments of the tradition. For if it is true that the conception of the seated Buddha is one into which the genius of the greatest artist may be poured without any lack of room for its complete expansion, it is also true that this *motif* even in a shapeless or grotesque form remains for those whose spiritual heritage it is, a well understood symbol of eternal things. In the same way, by a study of other typical examples of Indian religious art, the relation of art and religion in India may be understood.

This paper is thus an elementary study of the religious psychology of Iudian art. Certain conclusions may be drawn. In the first place, the proper study of Indian art has hardly yet begun. By a proper study is meant not merely a close study of the weak and relatively unimportant semi-classic style of North-west India in the first few centuries after Christ, but a study of the development of the Indian ideal and its emancipetion from foreign formulae unsuited to its expression. True Indian art is as little understood in the to-day, as Indian philosophy and literature a hundred years ago. This is illustrated by a recent pronouncement of no less eminent an archaeologist than Mr. Vincent Smith : 'After A. D. 300 Indian sculpture properly so called hardly deserves to be reckoned as art.' Such a statement is only to be paralleled with Lord Macaulay's famous dictum upon the value of Oriental literature.

It remains to be seen what value will be set upon Indian art in the West, and what influence it will have upon Western art, when it is as well known to artists as Japanese art is even at the

present day That influence should result in some real application of psychological principles in the consideration of the aims and purpose of art, and in the education of artists.

At present the education of Western artists is an education merely in technique ; the imagination is left to take care of itself, so long as the imitative powers are fully developed. Now if there is one thing which distinguishes the true artist from other men, it is not a knowledge of anatomy or a capacity for the meticulous imitation of nature, but it is the power of mental vision, of visualisation, literally 'imagination.' Instead of being taught by meditation and concentration to cultivate this power, the Western student's whole time is taken up with copying things that are set before his physical eyes. The true Indian artist, on the other hand, who does not regard the reproduction of still life as the aim of art, is taught by memory work and practice in visualisation to form a definite and perfect mental picture before he begins to draw or crave at all ; his whole endeavour is to cultivate the power of mind-seeing. It is in this respect that Western art has most to learn from India.

Further, the distinction between naturalism and idealism in art is one that is fundamentally religious. Religion, for India, is much more a metaphysic than a dogma ; and it is the lack of a metaphysic in modern Western materialistic culture, and in the surviving realism of Semitic theology, that makes it possible for the Western artist now to find sufficient satisfaction in the imitation of beautiful appearances, and a sufficient aim for art in the giving of pleasure.

It is not, however, possible for the greatest art to flourish, if men can believe in nothing more real and more eternal than the external face of nature. The true world of art is not the phenomenal world about us, but an ideal world of the imagination.

Finally, as regards the future of art in India, two tendencies are apparent to-day, one inspired by the technical achievements of the modern West, the other a reaction towards the spiritual idealism of the East. If the greatest art is always both National and Religious—and how empty any other art must be !—it is in the latter tendency alone that we can trace the germ of a new and greatest Indian art, that shall fulfill and not destroy the past.

THE DIVINE WARNING.

The sun hung low on Uppoor plain,
The day was nigh its close,
And suddenly the winds broke out,
To violence from repose.

Never did blast so turbulent
Roar on that windy shore
No grove nor wall to meet the rage
The naked hamlet bore.

The vulture borne on mighty wings,
Did stagger in the air,
And making way to the nearest tree,
Nevermore a flight did dare.

Was it the howl of an evil sprite
That thundered angrily ?
Was it the tumult ominous
Of its dread mutiny ?

Deep flushed the west, the frightened sun
Was quenched before her ire ;
And for a time the earth could seem
O'er-ruled by spectres dire.

The ruddy gloom still ruddier grew
On water, wall and tree,
The children screamed and clasped their mothers,
Dismayed in high degree.

Was it a rain of blood or fire,
That in the west did fall ?
No tree was seen nor cottage trim,
The red clouds shrouded all.

The winds prevailed and thick'ning clouds
In curling volumes rolled,
And spread on high their awful folds
With swiftness uncontrolled.

The clouds closed in, what was their freight ?
The wond'ring people feared ;
Was it hell-fire or wrath of Heaven ?
The doubt was shortly cleared.

The clouds closed in, there was a shower
Of dust for minutes three,
And soon the steady winds blew off
The red clouds o'er the sea.

This portent bode, did folk avow,
Sure evil to the king,
And from the temple's vault that night
Did plaintive prayers ring,

A. SUBRAHMANYAM, B.A.

A CONVENTION OF RELIGIONS IN INDIA.

It has been proposed that there should be a Convention for the elucidation of the doctrines for the different religions followed by the different sections of the Indian Community. To give effect to the above proposal, a Committee consisting of the following gentlemen have been formed :—

1. Sj. Sarada Charan Mitra, (late Puisne Judge, High Court).
   PRESIDENT.
2. Raja Peary Mohan Mukerjee, C. S. I.
3. Sj. Satyendra Nath Tagore, C. S
4. R. D. Mehta, Esqr., C. I. E.
5. Rai Narendra Nath Sen Bahadur.
6. Babu Maharaj Bahadur Sing.
7. Rai Rajendra Chandra Sastri Bahadur, M. A.
8. Mahamahopadhyaya Satis Chandra Bidyabhusan, M. A., PH. D.

9. Moulvi Siraj-ul-Islam Khan Bahadur.
10. Moulvi Mirza Abul-Fazl.
11. Sj. Gaganendra Nath Tagore.
12. Sj. Abanindra Nath Tagore.
13. Rev. B. C. Sarkar.
14. Mahasthabir Ganalankar.
15. Purnananda Bhikshu.
16. Sj. Dhannoo Lal Agarwalla.
17. Swami Suddhananda.
18. Sj. Charoo Chandra Bose.
19. Dr. J. N. Kanjilal, M. B.

SECRETARIES.

20. Sj. Bhupendra Kumar Bore, M.A., B.L.
21. Sj. Kumud Bandhu Sen.

Theses on the following amongst other religions and the different sects thereof will be read at the Convention.

1. Hinduism
   (a) Buddhism
   (b) Jainaism
   (c) Shaktaism
   (d) Vaishnavism
   (e) Saivaism
   (f) Sikhism
   (g) Brahmoism
   (h) Arya Samaj
   (i) Theosophy.
2. Christianity
3. Islamism
4. Zoroastrianism
5. Judaism

The Committee think it desirable that each religious Community should elect its own representative to elucidate its doctrines at the Convention.

Gentlemen desiring to read these are respectfully requested to communicate with the Secretary at 85 Grey Street, Calcutta, but no theses will be received after the 20th instant.

Every theses should contain elucidation of the principles of the religion or religious sect dealt with by it and state its peculiar features distinguishing it from other religions and other religious sects, but it should not contain any attack, direct or indirect, or any sect or religion. No paper should take more than half an hour to read.

Every effort will be made to hold the Convention by the end of last week of January. The precise date will be announced on or about the 20th instant.

KUMUD BANDHU SEN,
Secretary.

Note.—We are glad to state that Mr. J. M. Nallaswami Pillai will read a paper on 'Saivaism' at the convention.